

MARY FERRELL FOUNDATION

preserving the legacy

www.maryferrell.org



Title: Orleans Parish Grand Jury Testimony of William Gurvich, 28 June 1967

Author: n/a

Pages: 54

Agency: n/a

RIF#: n/a

Subjects: n/a

Source: AARC



ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

JUNE 28, 1967

William Guivier

ORLEANS PARISH GRAND JURY

PROCEEDINGS OF

JUNE 28, 1967

SPECIAL INVESTIGATION

PRESENT: MR. JIM GARRISON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY,
MESSRS. ALVIN OSER, JAMES ALCOCK, RICHARD BURNES,
ANDREW SCIAMBRA AND WILLIAM MARTIN, ASSISTANT
DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

WITNESS:

WILLIAM GURVICH

* * * *

Reported By:
Maureen B. Thiel,
Secretary, Orleans Parish
Grand Jury

WILLIAM GURVICH, after being duly sworn by the Foreman of the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, was questioned and answered as follows:

MR. ALCOCK:

Q. For the record, please state your name?

A. William H. Gurvich.

Q. Are you represented by an attorney?

A. I have just recently considered taking one, yes. I have not had time to talk to him, I saw him in the hall.

Q. I saw you here with Ed Baldwin. Have you had occasion to discuss with him your rights before the Grand Jury?

A. Well no, not in full - we were going into it.

Q. Do you feel like you ought to discuss your rights with him fully?

A. Will I be permitted to give my testimony tonight?

Q. I think if you have an attorney you should talk to him before you talk to us.

A. Well, let's just play it by ear and take it from here - I think I know enough about my rights.

Q. Of course you know that anything you say here can be held against you - and if you lie the Grand Jury can indict you for perjury. You understand that?

A. Yes, sure.

Q. You also have a right, under the Fifth Amendment, that you

don't have to say anything that would incriminate you under State or Federal law.

A. I realize that.

Q. BY MR. BURNES:

You are aware that you have the same right under the State law that you are not required to answer any question that tends to incriminate you?

A. Yes, I know that.

MR. ALCOCK:

Bill, you expressed publicly in the press and on television a desire to speak to the Grand Jury, either Federal or State, and this Grand Jury is willing to listen to you if you have any statement that you want to make right off the bat.

A. I want to read this to you - I have already read it publicly. (reading): I was served a subpoena by the Grand Jury about 10:10 last night and this came as a result of charges brought by me of misconduct and malfeasance by Jim Garrison during his assassination investigation. In fairness to me and an objective search for the truth I ask the Grand Jury to allow me to tell them outside the presence of Mr. Garrison and his aides. All I ask is fair play. These charges are made against the District Attorney. I anticipate that Mr. Garrison will make every effort to harass me and obscure what I have to say, with such smoke screen tactics as CIA

represents and other irrelevant subjects. After I finish telling my story I will welcome an opportunity to confront Mr. Garrison personally. I also ask you, Mr. LaBiche, to insist that some objective person conduct the investigation of Garrison's office, preferably the Attorney General. This present situation is exactly the same as when Attorney General Gremillion stepped in to investigate and prosecute/ ^{Garrison} in the defamation case brought by the Judges of the Criminal Court. On such short notice I have had no opportunity to collect my files on the investigation, given time I will supply you with affidavits and witnesses who are scattered around the country as well as local witnesses who have been intimidated or threatened. (end of statement)

MR. OSER:

An Assistant has to appear in the room.

A. I did not mean that.

FOREMAN:

And we have quite a lot of questions that we would like to ask you too. We subpoenaed you because you requested it, I got the telegram in which you requested to appear late yesterday morning.

A. May I ask, if it is proper now, who calls the witnesses?

FOREMAN:

Q. I do, I call them.

A. In what order? Do you or the District Attorney call them?

Q. I call them.

A. All right, sir. I mean not to summon me here, but to decide when I would appear?

Q. I had things that had to be fitted in, things that had not been foreseen. We were running late and that is why I sent you word to return at 2:15.

A. 3:00 o'clock.

Q. We were delayed again, we didn't get out to lunch until quite late.

A. That is all right, I am not complaining.

Q. We thought that we would let you say what you wanted to say.

A. Well, as I said, I got the subpoena at 10:10 last night and if I had something to say I would like to have something to corroborate it.

Q. I called you yesterday morning.

A. Yes, you called me yesterday morning, but that doesn't give me time to get what I need, the sworn affidavits and witnesses. I would like to give you as strong a case as I can. Its 7:00 o'clock in the evening and I have been here since 8:30 this morning. I was called for 9:30, but I got here early.

JUROR:

Are you prepared to answer questions?

A. I could answer some of the questions, yes. But in the few hours only I have had I am really not.

Q. How long would it take?

A. Certainly not long. But if I am going to give you my case I would like to give it to you from beginning to end. I need more time.

Q. How much time?

A. Today is Wednesday - I have to call the people and say when can you get on the plane, when can you come in, when can you get offwork. I would expect at least over the weekend.

Q. Are you making these accusations that you have made publicly without the information?

A. No sir.

Q. You say you have the affidavits?

A. No, I haven't spoken with the people who have promised me this morning they would give me affidavits.

Q. On the strength of that you have made public statements? On the strength of that alone?

A. No, not on that alone. No sir. On 7 months of affiliation with the office, I made the remarks.

Q. Yet you are not prepared to defend those remarks?

A. Well, as I said, there will be some questions I can answer.

I don't need extra time for all of them. Are you all meeting

next Wednesday? Or Tuesday?

6.

Q. Tuesday is the Fourth of July.

A. Are you saying that if you can't time these people - people from several parts of the country?

A. Yes, I am.

Q. To come in here?

A. I know they will come in here.

Q. These people will come in at their own expense?

A. Yes sir.

Q. How many of these people are involved?

A. Four, possibly five.

Q. Do you have the names of those people?

A. Are you asking me?

Q. Yes, I am asking you.

A. I would call Mr. James Phelan, Mr. Matt Herron, Mr. Walter Sheridan, Mr. Rick Townley

Q. These are all news media people?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. Isn't Rick Townley with WDSU-TV -

A. Yes, he is local.

Q. The others would be out of town?

A. Yes.

MR. ALCOCK:

Bill, are these people going to give off hear-say?

A. No, it won't be hearsay.

Q. It will be direct testimony?

A. Yes, direct testimony.

Q. It is unusual to have a witness call witnesses - that is for the Grand Jury. If the Grand Jury thinks something warrants investigation they will call their own witnesses. Its unusual to have a witness come in and say look, I want to call a witness. I think perhaps if you give the Grand Jury sufficient basis or let them ask you questions, and they think it warrants calling witnesses then they will call them.

A. All right. I will tell you as briefly as possible. I don't have their sworn affidavits before me but it amounts to this: these people have spoken to witnesses who have testified in the case of State vs. Clay Shaw, one witness or more, has said to them that he lied while under oath. In one instance this was said to a man while another man was present

Q. Would you care to name names?

A. Yes sir. Matt Herron and James Phelan.

Q. Who was the witness they said lied under oath?

A. Perry Russo.

Q. Assuming the truth, which of course we don't, what has that to do with the charges of browbeating witnesses?

A. You are going from one thing to another - do you want to talk about browbeating witnesses? I will be glad to.

Q. Well, that is what we are interested in.

A. Well, nobody said that - is that what you want to hear now?

Browbeating witnesses.

FOREMAN:

Let's take one case at a time. After all, we have spent a lot of time ourselves on this.

A. Well, when two reputable people say they will go under oath and swear to something I think they should be heard out.

Mr. Garrison thought so Saturday before last in Monticello, New York, when Mr. Phelan traveled there and told him of his conversation with Mr. Russo. It was apparently alarming enough to cause Mr. Garrison to say if that is the case I will have to nolle prosequi it. Now I am not with the office anymore and I don't know if he has investigated the truth of Perry Russo or not. Mr. Phelan said that Matt Herron was with him when Russo made his remarks. Walter Sheridan also talked to Perry Raymond Russo.

Q. Do you know it, of your own personal knowledge, to be true that Perry Russo told these two people that?

A. Of course not - I would have had to be there and heard it. But if they are willing to come here and at their own expense and appear above your group, then I say I would like to have them here to corroborate anything I say.

Q. The question is do you know of your own personal knowledge that this is the truth?

A. No, I do not know that it is true.

Q. You are making charges on hearsay evidence.

A. Pertaining to what?

Q. Pertaining to Russo lying.

A. Did I make the statement that Russo lied? Now, is it the browbeating you want to go into?

Q. Where did the statement take place that Russo told Phelan and Herron that he lied? In Orleans Parish or out of the state?

A. It could have been East Baton Rouge or Orleans, because conversations were held in both.

Do you have any questions you would like to ask me about Russo? You did ask me to name the people and I did name them.

Q. I would like to ask how many other people

A. May I say this, please? If I came in and handed you a sworn affidavit - would that be permissible?

A. No.

Q. How many other people have you been told by say, Sheridan, Herron and other people who have testified in this case have lied under oath - how many others, and who are they?

A. Only Russo.

JUROR:

What you are saying is that these two news media said Russo spoke to them and told them that he lied in court - on the stand? Or before the Grand Jury?

A. Yes. He lied in court. On the stand.

MR. OSER:

About material things, Bill, the meetings that took place, or non material things?

A. I can give you the people and you can hear them out.

Q. You don't know whether or not it was material things such as it wasn't Clay Shaw it was somebody else, I lied - You don't know whether that is the statement or not?

A. My impression is that it was about material things.

Q. They didn't tell you?

A. They didn't specify, no.

Q. Was it the statement Russo gave to Phelan - verbal statement or was it in writing?

A. It was not in writing.

Q. How long ago did you get this information?

A. Oh, possibly two weeks ago.

Q. Where did you get this information?

A. I got it from Mr. Phelan.

Q. Where were you at the time you got this information?

A. I was in New York City. Mr. Phelan was in California - I talked to him at my expense.

Q. Did you get the information from anyone else besides Mr. Phelan?

A. About Russo or about Phelan having the story?

Q. This information I have just asked you about while you were in New York City - was the source of information anyone other than Mr. Phelan. In other words, did you ask Matt Herron or anyone else?

A. No, I didn't speak to Matt Herron because Mr. Phelan said he knew exactly where Matt was at the time, he moves about a little bit, taking pictures, and he would contact him and assured me that he would be glad to appear and make any sworn affidavit that I needed.

Q. In other words, your source of information that Perry Russo lied is from one person only, is that correct?

A. No sir. I also talked to Sheridan. That is two people.

Q. Where were you when you talked to Mr. Sheridan?

A. Either in New York or In New Orleans. He had mentioned it to me several times, first in New Orleans.

Q. When?

A. Maybe a month or two back.

Q. Is there any reason why you waited a month or so to ask

Phelan about it when Sheridan

A. He didn't mention Phelan a month ago, he mentioned that he had talked to Russo and that Russo had lied and he would be glad to state this under oath.

Q. Did you tell that to Jim Garrison?

A. I was not around Jim - he was out of town - I went to New York to see him.

Q. Did you bring this information to the attention of any ...

A. Excuse me, he had already left.

Q. Did you bring this information to the attention of any member of the New Orleans Police Department, or any member of the District Attorney's Office?

A. No, I certainly didn't.

Q. Did you give this information to anyone else prior to one week ago?

A. About my conversations with these people?

Q. Right.

A. To anyone else?

Q. That is the question.

A. Well, that is a tough one to answer - like I might have said to someone extremely close to me that - man, I am sorta shook, somebody telling me this - I don't remember.

Q. Did you give it to any of your partners?

A. I don't remember discussing it with them.

Q. Did you give it to any member of the Justice Department or a Federal Agency?

A. No.

Q. Did you give this information to Robert Kennedy?

A. No. I will repeat that, no.

Q. This is the first time you have given this information to anyone except your statement to the press?

A. I said possibly someone very close to me.

Q. Who would that be?

A. Just anyone, close friend or someone who might have knowledge - I just don't remember. That was my answer.

Q. Did you state why you waited from one month ago to two weeks ago to contact Mr. Phelan about this information?

A. I had - did I say it was a month ago that I heard about Phelan?

Q. I don't know what your answer was, but will you tell them why you did not contact Mr. Phelan when you first heard this information?

A. I did contact Phelan, but I did not say Mr. Sheridan told me about Mr. Phelan.

Q. Didn't you wait two weeks to tell him that?

A. Two weeks after what?

Q. Two weeks after you learned this from Sheridan.

A. Well, it was some time, I won't say exactly two weeks, several days - maybe two weeks. I didn't mark the calendar.

Q. Mr. Sheridan didn't tell you Mr. Phelan was there, did he? This is a different instance you are talking about, isn't it?

A. Mr. Sheridan was talking about his meeting with Russo - and Phelan is a different meeting, entirely different. If I gave the impression that it was all at one time I apologize.

Q. Have you heard this same information from anyone else other than Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Phelan?

A. No. I have rumors - but no. Not from anyone else, I didn't talk to anyone else. The others were not available when I wanted to talk. As I said, Mr. Phelan told me he knew everything as to where Mr. Herron was and would contact him and assured me of his cooperation.

Q. Did you contact Perry Russo to find out if this was true?

A. I did not know how to contact Perry Russo.

Q. Did you ever have a conversation with Perry Russo?

A. One, yes.

Q. Where?

A. In Mr. Garrison's office.

Q. Is that the only time you ever had a conversation with him?

A. Well, he was in and out of the office - I don't know what you call a conversation. I might have said hello in the hall, or something like that - but the only conversation that I remember, if it was a true conversation, was the day he came into Mr. Garrison's office to take his first lie detector test. He came up the elevator, I was at Jim's desk working and he sat down and we introduced ourselves.

Q. Did you know anyone who could contact Perry Russo?

A. I would assume that Mr. Sciambra and other people like that would know how to get him. But I didn't think anybody would put me in contact with him.

Q. This is the only witness who has been accused of giving false testimony, is that correct?

A. Yes, best of my memory right now, yes.

Q. Bill, what did you go to New York for?

A. Strictly pleasure trip.

Q. Who got you to see Bobby Kennedy? Who got you the meeting with him?

A. Mr. Sheridan.

Q. Did you discuss the meeting with Kennedy before you left?

A. I don't understand that.

Q. Did you speak to Sheridan prior to leaving the City of New Orleans about getting the meeting with Kennedy?

A. Yes, I asked him to make the arrangements.

Q. Why did you go to Sheridan?

A. Is this a normal method of interrogation? Like right now?

Q. Yes. Of course you have a right to not answer.

A. Yes, I know. I have been apprised of my rights.

Q. The question is why did you feel that Sheridan could get you an appointment with Kennedy?

A. He worked for Kennedy.

Q. When did he work for Robert Kennedy?

A. When? I don't know exactly when.

Q. How did you know he worked for Kennedy?

A. Because he told me, in fact the first night I met him at the Royal Orleans he told me during that time.

Q. Did you contact Sheridan or did he contact you?

A. Actually it was by accident. It was in the La Louisiane Restaurant. He was in town, I came in one night to eat, I was sitting at a table talking to Jim Moran and Sheridan was sitting at the bar. We saw each other about the same time and we ate together and had a couple of drinks.

Q. Did you have anything to do with this NBC program?

A. Absolutely nothing. Not one iota. I was invited to the preview at 2:00 AM in New York City Monday morning.

Q. Who got you that invitation?

A. Mr. Sheridan.

- A. And at 9:00 A.M. I called the office and talked to Charlie Ward and told him I had seen it and told him what it was about. Later I talked to Jim about 4:00 that afternoon.

JUROR:

You obviously have consideration and regard for this group as a Grand Jury, otherwise you would not have made a request to talk before this body, and I am wondering why if you had some pertinent information, as closely as you were associated with the District Attorney's Office and also also to this Grand Jury, since you sat in on some of the Mark Lane lectures and we had lunch together, and you obviously had a pretty intense interest in this case at one time ...

- A. At one time I did - up until the very end.
- Q. Well, I am wondering why in a few weeks you should suddenly change your mind about this and I assume that the information that Mr. Sheridan and the other gentleman gave you, I am wondering why, knowing the Grand Jury as a conscientious body of citizens interested in the welfare of themselves and lots of other people in the area, you would not have communicated this information to us before you became involved in making public accusations, and brought it to a body who

has the investigative power to investigate information such as you have received, if there was wrongdoing in this Department or Police Department. Did you feel that we were incapable of doing it and you thought we would not do it? Also you stated publicly that this Grand Jury had been duped and also that it was being advised by the District Attorney, implying that perhaps the District Attorney was perhaps influencing us in our opinions in our investigations? Why?

- A. I did use the word dupe, and apologies wouldn't mean anything because, in my opinion, you have, like many others, been duped and I confine that to this. There was no reason, in my opinion, to arrest Clay Shaw and the day it was done, March 1, 1967, Mr. James Alcock and I were returning from Houston and we walked in the office and found Mr. Shaw there and I don't know how long he had been there and I don't know how long he had been brought in before he was technically arrested, my remark after that was, why did he do it? Mr. Alcock said, much later than that, if you and I had been there, Bill, it would never have happened.

Q. Bill, just answer the question?

- A. Why I didn't come to you? I used the methods I thought best. I would be a darn fool to come before you after having used the word dupe and I know the exact position I

am in, that of a turncoat, but I am acting on my word of interest honor, under oath, in the ~~name~~ of justice, not for any money. I have never done anything for or with NBC. On June 10 I interviewed a woman on East 72 Street, her name is Mrs. Janis Taber, 30 E. 72 St., New York City, N. Y. I did this - Mr. Garrison had me contact Mr. Dudley Dougherty of Beeville, Texas. There was a note written on yellow paper, like this, Bill Gurvich handle. And I handled it, just the way I handled other things like that. I went to New York after talking to Mr. Dougherty in Beeville, and he had this information contact this woman she knows something about the assassination. Well, she didn't. But it isn't the first thing I ran out. I employed the methods I thought best, if it seems disrespectful I am sorry. I did it the way I had planned it and the way I wanted to and I have no answer. It is not because I distrusted this Jury, sincerely it was not.

Q. Bill, let me clarify something. If you felt that strongly at the time - and I am telling the Jury at this time that what you said is correct. We were off to Houston, went to Dallas first, and we had never heard of Perry Russo. We got back and found out that the arrest was imminent - we asked Mr.

Garrison to go in Charlie Ward's office with us and said

additional
why are you arresting this man (Shaw) and what/evidence do

you have and if he had had no additional evidence both of us would have been vehemently opposed to the arrest of Clay Shaw, but at this time he advised me of Russo, the conversation in the apartment, the man he identified as Oswald, the man subjected to sodium penthatol and with that explanation, since I had never met the man, Andrew Schiambra had interviewed him, I took it at face value and I assume you did too since you read a statement to the press. If you were sickened by the arrest why did you read the statement of the arrest? I left, I did not think they had sufficient evidence to arrest Shaw but when I came back and found out about Russo, it was a different story. I cannot understand why you are sickened by it - you are the one who read it.

- A. I will clarify that, if you are looking for perjury charges. I read it because Mr. Garrison told me to read it. He said you are my chief aide, read it. Then a long time after that in a joking way, I said to Hoke May and Ross Yockey when they were talking about it, I said well, it was my birthday which it was, March 1st, quite a coincidence, and I have since learned that it was also Clay Shaw's birthday. And he said here is a birthday present, read it. I did say it to those

two.

- Q. And you also said something about this is the most exciting day of my life, or moment of my life.
- A. I do not ever recall saying that. And only newspaper people could say I did.
- Q. You said if we are looking for a perjury charge?
- A. I think Mr. Garrison is.
- Q. Do you think we are looking for one?
- A. No, I really don't. I have been here a long time maybe I am tired. I am sorry I said that, no of course not. There was never a cross word between us.

JUROR:

- Mr. Garrison never indicated anything at all. All he came up and asked was if we wanted to ask him any questions.
- A. Maybe I was hasty.
- Q. We don't have that thought in our minds. But you are a little bitter about something. What about?
- A. I am bitter, sir, for having spent 7 months of my life in the most fraudulent investigation I have ever seen.
- Q. We just went and reported to the Judge and we had no idea of doing anything with you.
- A. I didn't say you did, Mr. LaBiche, honest, I didn't.
- Q. Well, get it out of your mind.
- A. You said you thought I was bitter?
- Q. No, I am not bitter, I might be very tired.

Q. If you felt so strongly about this why didn't you leave?

A. Well, I remarked to a couple of people around the office sometimes that I don't see this, or that - if I had quit it would have hurt the investigation if I had walked out and I was hoping that Mr. Garrison would stumble across something, something to help the investigation.

Q. Mr. Gurvich, Mr. Garrison gave you a file on the investigation? A master file?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you returned it?

A. Not yet.

Q. Why not?

A. I have not had time, nor the opportunity.

Q. Will you return it. It is the property of the State.

A. I assume it would be, sir.

Q. Do you plan to?

A. Yes sir, definitely sir.

Q. Have you given any information in this file to anybody else?

A. No sir.

Q. What type of compensation did you have in this case?

A. None. We never did discuss it. I have been reimbursed \$3410.00 for my services. On May 1st I got a thousand, and on June 1st I got \$2400.00.

Q. You made the statement that you wasted 7 months of your life? Wasn't the work voluntary on your part?

A. Well, I don't know. Mr. Garrison appeared before the Jury and I think he gave the impression that I was not being paid, one of you or two of you commented on the fact that people who would offer their time and services ...

Q. You said 7 months, or whatever it was, you found a waste - why did you stay so long?

A. As I said, maybe he did have something somewhere, I just never did see it. But I was loyal to him.

Q. Did you think that you were informed and knew everything that there was - you had access to all of the evidence that was involved?

A. Well, I asked him, even in April, I said

Q. Well, perhaps he didn't think it feasible or necessary - is that the reason for you to make all these accusations?

A. Yes sir, I think it was.

Q. When you stated that you were disappointed at the arrest but kept hoping that something good would come up, and in one of your press conferences you stated that you made the decision at the time Shaw was arrested - you recall the conference I am talking about? Did you make a statement to the press that you were acting as double agent shortly after the time Shaw was arrested?

A. Did I say those exact words?

Q. I don't remember the exact words - do you recall the conference?

A. No, I do not. I don't remember saying that.

Q. Did you make any remark to the press about being a double agent? Shortly after the time Clay Shaw was arrested.

A. I don't remember sayint ghat, no.

Q. Did you make any statements to the press about being a double agent?

A. Yes, I made a statement to the press about being a double agent.

Q. And what did you state about the time of your being a double agent?

A. Now, may I be permitted to say what I said? I said if I am a double agent then I was a double agent working for Mr. Garrison and a double agent working for justice, the inference being ~~being~~ there is a difference as I see it.

Q. And didn't you follow that with, that was why you remained in this office 7 months so you could obtain this information on the investigation?

A. No, that's a lie. I did not say 7 months, you've got it all screwed up. It couldn't possibly have been, I was only in there 7 months.

Q. Weren't you asked by the press why you stayed?

A. I was not working against Mr. Garrison. I was working for him.

Monday before last he told me on the phone get down here, from New York, this is the evening before the NBC show went on, just hours before, I ~~had~~ ^{have} pictures coming in and I need you to identify a rifle, which turned out to be a shotgun.

Q. In your testimony, did it upbuild you as working for Mr. Garrison?

A. I don't remember. I'll take my files and tapes and tell it, you the exact time I could not pinpoint/the days would pass and pass and pass.

Q. In one of your press conferences you stated

A. Would you mind going into the browbeating right now?

Q. I am asking the questions. In one of your press conferences you stated / that the District Attorney's Office, or members of the office, not clarifying whether staff members, clerical or investigators, committed illegal acts which were illegal under State and Federal law, and you wanted to go before both Federal and Parish Grand Juries, and that ^{Mr.}Mr. Garrison knew what these acts were and ordered them and that more than 2 persons, other than Mr. Garrison, were involved. Is this essentially correct?

A. Yes. Essentially yes.

Q. What were the illegal acts?

A. I always thought dragging people in over and over to be questioned and cross examined and subjecting them to lie detector tests against their will

Q. Who was subjected to lie detector tests against their will?

A. In my opinion, Carlos Quiroga.

Q. Was he subjected to it against his will?

A. In my opinion, yes.

Q. What statute states that?

A. You know I am not a lawyer, I can look it up, it must be somewhere.

Q. Is this the only illegal act you are referring to?

A. No. I heard Mr. Garrison dictate letters like this to people, or dictate verbal orders to have people working in certain facilities to come in and if they had any trouble coming in just say write the employer and say we would like to have your employee come in to talk to him.

Q. What statute does that violate?

A. Only the U.S. Attorney or the State Attorney could tell me that.

In my opinion that is not right, and that we would say we would like to talk to your employee because he is a witness in the assassination of President Kennedy and then Mr. Garrison

said how will that grab 'em, how long will NASA let them work at Cape Kennedy now, or elsewhere, that might be at NASA or Cape Kennedy.

Q. How many people were forced to take the polygraph against their will?

A. I don't remember at this time.

Q. Do you know of anyone other than Carlos Quiroga?

A. Yes, I would say Mr. Coffee of Cape Kennedy. I don't remember the first name. He was forced to take the polygraph and stay overnight.

Q. Was Mr. Coffee forced to take it?

A. In my opinion, he was.

Q. Where was it administered? The test?

A. I believe in the building at 610 Poydras St. My office.

Q. Were you present?

A. No.

Q. Who else do you know who was compelled to take the polygraph?

A. That is all I remember at this time. Those 2 people.

It only takes one for me to make that remark, but I can only remember 2.

Q. You say other people were forced to come and be questioned and cross-examined, who were these people?

A. Are you referring to something I said

Q. I am referring to something you said about two minutes ago.

A. Which was what?

Q. Illegal acts, Mr. Garrison forced people to come in to be cross-examined and take poly graph tests against their wills.

A. In order to go into detail I would have to consult my records, notes that I have made.

Q. Do you know the single name of a person at this time?

A. Not at this time, no.

Q. Did you know the name of the person you were referring to when you made that statement?

A. No.

Q. And you don't know any person ^{you thought} he brought in who/was forced to be cross examined by an illegal act or take a lie detector test?

A. No. Maybe we are not getting along on the right lines. You want to know how many people I think were

Q. Give the name of any one person you were referring to when you stated that, or made public statement of that?

A. Will you give me a minute?

Q. Yes.

JUROR:

Bill, do you know the names of some of the people that such a letter was written to?

A. I didn't see anybody drop the letter in the chute, no, I didn't see that. I saw a letter written and it was intended to go to Coffee or any of the people who work at the Michoud facility here, and he said this is the way to do it, the letter could only be sent to top security places, if a guy

worked at Cape Kennedy send the letter, what do you think NASA is going to say when they get it - the guy is canned. If he wants to come

Q. Who got such a letter, can you tell us anybody?

A. Sir, I heard him say these things, I didn't say that he received it, I heard him say these things and that he intended to do it. I said I did not see the letter go in the chute.

Q. Now you tell us that on that basis you can make allegations you have made publicly?

A. Well, I spoke to Mr. Coffee when he was here and he was required to stay overnight because of the interrogation and the lie detector test.

Q. How do you physically make somebody take a lie detector test?

A. No, I didn't say he physically made him.

Q. How do you force somebody to do that?

A. By instilling fear like if you don't some way or other your name

Q. What was the fear he instilled in them?

A. Well, if a person worked in a NASA facility

Q. Quiroga. How would he coerce him?

A. Mr. Quiroga anticipated arrest as an accessory after the fact.

Q. Wasn't he involved? Doesn't he have to be questioned?

A. Not if he doesn't want to be, no sir.

Q. Not by the D.A.?

A. Not if he doesn't want to be.

MR. BURNES:

Q. Mr. Gurvich you were trying to give me the name of a person who was forced to be brought in and cross examined.

A. I don't remember at this time.

Q. Did you have a name in mind when you made the statement to the Grand Jury a little while ago, or to the press?

A. Is it permissible for me to see my attorney right now?

A. Yes. (exit)

(continued by Mr. Gurvich)

When I came here I thought I had a story to tell and if I have a story I would like to be able to tell it to you.

JUROR:

You told us you couldn't until you got additional information.

A. At least when I am fresh. I have been 12 hours, I haven't eaten since noon.

MR. BURNES:

Could you give me the name of that person, or persons, who were brought in for cross examination, which you thought was an illegal act?

A. Yes, I think the case of Lefty Peterson, the coaching of him in the way of testimony.

Q. Your statement was force him to come in for cross-examination.

questioning and taking lie detector tests and writing letters to their employers.

A. I am sorry I did not hear the first part of your statement.

Q. Your statement was for illegal action in forcing people to come in for questioning, cross examination, taking lie detector tests and writing letters to their employers.

A. I said that I saw a letter written - I did not say that it had been sent - I did not see the mail.

Q. Is that what you said the 3 illegal acts are, the 3 things you told me you thought were illegal acts of Mr. Garrison, dragging people in for questioning and cross examination, forcing them to take lie detector tests and writing letters to their employers, or threatening to write letters to their employers. Is that the 3 things, illegal acts?

A. Yes. Now, before we go any further may I have the opportunity of coming in fresh and I hope I am not a defendant yet, and I welcome the opportunity of appearing, I said I wanted to. I want to give you my story.

FOREMAN:

We would like to have you tell us today, we would like to know about this browbeating. Who did he browbeat? Who did the browbeating? Give us the names of the people who were browbeat.

A. I don't remember at this time.

MR. OSER:

Perhaps I can clarify something. Bill, I think one of the reasons the Jury sent the subpoena out for today is you commented last night on television that you wanted to appear in front of the Grand Jury and that next time they met you would be at the door and beat the door down to get in. That is why the subpoena was sent you today. That is what they are talking about. It is not that you are being cross examined and certainly you are not a defendant. This is the reason it was sent to you. You said you had a story to tell us.

A. But can I tell it to you.

Q. Go ahead. You are free to tell us.

A. You want me to give you the 7 months story now?

JUROR:

Q. I am prepared to stay here all night to hear your story.

A. Well, I am not, sir. I am admitting it - I am not looking to get out - I wouldn't say invite me here and then walk out on you.

FOREMAN:

Q. Now you have made a lot of statements to the press and everybody and what you have done is to intimate to this community that this Jury does not handle its responsibility, and we think we are, we think we are a pretty responsible group of people, and we don't think we are taken in by Mr.

Garrison or anybody else. Of course we have to take the cases given us and we think we are doing them correctly. If we think there is something wrong with Mr. Garrison's office we want to know it. Now, you have led everybody to believe that there is something terribly wrong in this office and that there are terrible people in here.....

A. I think there is something terribly wrong with Mr. Garrison.

Q. And that terrible things are being done. All we want you to do is tell us any evidence or anybody that we can find out evidence from - any of these things are wrong we want to know about them. And what you have told us at this point is that we have 3 names - we have discussed the procedure to be taken - and we want to listen to you all the way out. We thought you were ready to tell us a story. We want to hear the story. We also want to know the names of the people in this office mistreated and the names of the people in this office who are all wrong. We don't know of anybody in this office who is all wrong - we have been looking and trying - we have heard other people say things like that but up to this point they can't show us nothing. They can't give us the name of anyone. We know when people are lying to us and when they are ~~telling~~ telling us the truth, I think we do as a group - I don't think I am the smartest person in the

world - but I think all together this Jury is pretty good and I don't think anybody is handling us, Mr. Garrison or anybody else. I think that we, the Jury, are pretty good. And we, the Jury, make these decisions - and we really wanted to hear your whole story - and we will later when you put it together, we can do that. In the meantime we thought you made the statement and we were concerned about your statement. If they are right, good, and if they are wrong we want to say your statements are wrong. If you have something to give us we want you to give it to us and if not say you have nothing to give us. That is the way it should be. And we are trying to get you to give us something. But at this point you haven't given us anything.

A. Well, I am asking you, Mr. LaBiche, if you want the story, 7 months of it, and you ask now for me to give you 7 months story.

Q. I am asking you for particular charges against particular people.

A. Really what I am trying to ask is - like, how long will I be here tonight?

Q. Ten minutes to tell us the names of the people.

A. I don't remember the names of the people.

JUROR:

Q. You said you wanted to get into this thing of browbeating - you asked us to get into that. I want to stop and get into

this thing of browbeating. What browbeating are you referring to? Who got browbeat?

A. I think the case of Morris Brownley is an example of months ago narcotic charges were refused by the District Attorney's office and later when it was found that Mr. Brownley was a friend of the late Mr. Ferrie and was summoned to the office and had ^{so-}no/called pertinent information to give or some information corroborating any theories, the charges - the case was reopened and the charges placed on him. I heard Mr. Garrison say that will break him, that will make him talk. If it was not good enough in February, 1966, why ^{was}~~wasn't~~ it later on? When they reopened it. I don't believe in things like this.

Q. What case is this?

A. Morris Brownley. I always felt that Mr. Garrison sitting down and telling people who he knew were implicated in this plot as accessories after the fact, giving these names, mentioning names: William Boatner Reily, Dr. Alton Ochsner, Billie Monteleone, Mr. Monahan (phonetically), I am sorry .. it might be William, I don't know right now, Carlos Quiroga, Carlos Bringuire. I never saw anything, nor did he ever explain anything to me, tell me how they were implicated and I don't think people should be subjected to this, that their names should be dropped like he dropped them. Those are pretty

prominent names, Mr. LaBiche. He could say that about you, he could say it about me. He can say it about anybody, he is the D. A. I don't agree with those methods.

MR. ALCOCK:

Q. What did he do with these names, Bill, I don't remember hearing these names except right here.

A. I didn't say he told them to you, sir.

Q. You say he dropped them?

A. He gave them to people. He mentioned them to people

Q. To whom?

A. To whom? Is that a question, Mr. Alcock?

Q. Yes.

A. He mentioned it to Mr. Robert Richter, CBS, New York City; Joseph Wershba, CBS, New York City; Richard Billings, Editor, Life Magazine; and others - like I say, if you will let me, in a little bit, give you more I will give more. I will give you some people locally.

Q. How much time?

A. Like tomorrow - I am not playing a game here. I would be a damn fool to.

Q. The names you mentioned right here, Bill - given to CBS, what?

A. He told them that they were accessories after the fact - not all at one time but as the theories changed - it was Mr. Reily because Oswald worked there, he was convinced that

Reily, 79 years old, was a CIA and he was going to arrest him, he said he was.

Q. Bill, before you said browbeating

A. Is it permissible to interrupt me right now?

Q. Yes, it is.

A. Is it, Mr. LaBiche? Can't I stay on this subject?

Q. (Inaudible)

A. I don't remember anything about the browbeating. I would like to stay on this subject - I would like to stay on this subject.

Q. Go ahead.

A. Mr. Reily was a CIA man who employed Oswald and knew Oswald's mission. I heard him say that to people who have put those names down in their files and certainly if their names were mentioned and the story written their names would have been mentioned, if Shaw was convicted. It then went to Dr. Ochsner because Dr. Ochsner was connected with INCA. I heard him over and over and over again give these names to people and the people had told me - they will come to you and tell you - yes, he did say it - and I say its wrong for a District Attorney or anyone else to drop or give names of anyone regardless of their status to the press, to the news media.

JUROR:

Bill, giving these names to the news media - I haven't read

or heard of these people

A. It wasn't printed yet. These people are the ones who have not written the books yet.

Q. I am not following you.

Q. Why would it be any worse for the District Attorney to give out information, make a statement, than for someone else to make a statement? For instance, for you to make a statement to the paper or Jim Garrison make a statement to the paper?

A. His was based on theory and mine was based on experience, Witness.

Q. Are we to understand in the listing of these names

A. May I be permitted to interrupt in the listing of these names?

Q. Certainly.

A. Dr. Ochsner in the INCA deal because INCA is comprised of so many Latins and Ochsner is very actively engaged in work for the Cuban refugees, as I understand it. Billie Monteleone, his name was given, because he found the name of Billie Monteleone on a letterhead of a Cuban refugee organization, the exact name I do not recall at this time, I can give it to you tomorrow. Mr. Monahan because he worked at the coffee company, simply because he worked for Mr. Reily, he, too, knew, and Mr. Monahan because he, as I recall him saying but I do

not know it to be a fact, to be an FBI man; Carlos Quiroga because he once met Oswald; and Carlos Bringuere because , well it was his theory of course to which, I guess, he is entitled, had an altercation with Oswald but really they were friends - something like that. But I mention it to you this way, this, as I say, is unethical. These people have these names in their files, these people remember that. Reily - and I say you don't do this, William Boatner Reily - and Dr. Alton Ochsner, et cetera, not based on that, because he is with INCA, he is with a coffee company and he is a hotel man. Or he is a former FBI man.

Q. The question I tried to ask is; are you taking exception to the publication of these names because you feel that this is not something the District Attorney should do, or are you taking exception to it because you do not feel that there is any information regarding these people which is valid, german, to this whole investigation?

A. I will try to remember this question.

Q. Let me say it this way. I will break it down into two questions. Are you taking exception to the fact that these names were published ...

A. Published? I didn't say they were published.

Q. Given to be published - or do you feel that Mr. Garrison should not have involved these people because you don't feel they could in any way contribute to the investigation?

A. Well, I don't know what you mean by contributing. Mr. Reily could certainly contribute this much - he could verify that Oswald worked there, he could do this much.

Q. You don't know that Mr. Reily was a member of the CIA or not, do you?

A. No, I don't know but neither does he.

Q. But you can't take exception to this because you don't know whether it is true or not. I don't know. I buy your point on one side, but not on the other. I think you are pre-judging whether or not the district attorney has information which you may not be aware of.

Q. Is it possible that you are guilty of talking too much?

A. That's true.

Q. Is it possible that these names were mentioned off the record in conversation as possible suspects?

A. Mr. Garrison was very serious when he said it. He said it to several - well I wouldn't say several, I think it was two or three.

Q. Do you think it was something he was saying off the record or mentioning off the record?

A. He was telling the people the story because they would come in

and he would meet with them and tell them the story, the case, he would reveal names, one time it would be Reily, one time Ochsner, and they would change from time to time. And these people had this information and when the story was to be written these people had their names. Maybe he has a big mouth, I don't know. In referring to it I say he has no right to drop the names or give the names to the news media. I am choking up on it.

Q. Did you hear him give ~~him~~ these names to these people? To these different people - to this man and this man - differently?

A. Yes sir.

MR. BURNES:

Are these 3 names the only names he gave it to?

A. I said yes, there are more and if you will give me time I will give them to you.

MR. OSER:

Bill, is it your impression or opinion that Jim gave these names to these individuals that they were being given to these individuals to browbeat these particular people like Monteleone or Reily to come in and give information?

A. No, I don't think that.

MR. BURNES:

Q.

You asked us to go to browbeating, you mentioned browbeating - can you give us one example at this time?

A. I don't remember. Because we are going to begin to give out inaccurate now.

Q. But you asked me to go to browbeating. You said

A. I said I don't remember at this time.

Q. My question is do you have another name in connection with browbeating? You gave us one name, Brownley, do you have another name? Can you think of another name of browbeating?

A. I don't remember, Mr. Burnes.

FOREMAN:

Let me tell you why, Bill. I don't know whether the Jury will want to listen to you anymore at all. We were trying to see if you had anything to say and I think we are interested, but I think you are blowing your stack about nothing. You don't have any facts.

A. That is a serious statement to make Mr. LaBiche.

Q. And we have to decide whether we believe that you have no facts. You are blowing for some reason that we can't comprehend at all. We don't know why. I had been hoping that you would say enough to show that you have something worthwhile listening to. You may think you have something. You are good news media right now. Anybody else involved around here now could also make the front pages if they wanted to.

A. Thanks a lot.

Q. (continuing) It being a hot potato right now, for the newspapers. Certain people or groups of people want to kill this case for some reason and as far as we are concerned for Shaw, the case is out of our hands/ nothing we can do, as you probably know, once we indict there is only one person who can handle the case - it is out of our hands.

A. I did not know that until this morning.

Q. It is now in the hands of the District Attorney and a jury. There is nothing we can do about it. Of course our Jury thinks, I am sure, that if the same thing happened this morning or tomorrow morning we would take the same action that we took. We have heard nothing that would make us change our minds. We are even more convinced today of our action and that it is correct than we ever was. I want to close this thing up with you. If you have more statements to make and anybody else has more statements to make I would like to say that I would like to re-contact you tomorrow and let you know before you prepare this whole thing for a meeting within a week or two weeks. It is not that urgent sort of thing, you can prepare your whole thing and if you think you want to serve the community - and that is what it is for - we want to serve the community too. I

think we want to decide whether we even want to hear you again, whether we think you have anything to say. I am not telling you what the opinion is, I don't even know, we are going to decide after you leave and after we put the D. A. staff out of the room.

JUROR:

What was the subject of your conversation with Mr. Kennedy?

A. The subject of my conversation with Mr. Kennedy?

Q.. Yes.

A. You want it revealed?

A. Yes.

A. You want me to tell you what it was?

A. Yes.

A. I told him that I did not think we had anything in New Orleans to clarify his brother's death, that was the substance of it.

MR. OSER:

Bill, I think you were asked last night on Channel 6 whether or not you knew Clay Bertrand, and you said you had no comment.

Do you know who he is?

A. Yes.

Q. Who is he?

A. Let me put it this way, I heard this afternoon that it was Eugene Davis. When I made the comment last night I did not

know. I never knew until this man Davis had appeared here and Dean Andrews said so - I did not know until today.

Q. Last night when you were asked on television if you knew Clay Bertrand and you just said I have no comment, you, at that time, in fact did not know who Clay Bertrand was?

A. No, I did not.

Q. You left the impression to everybody that you knew.

A. Well, I didn't - not for sure and still don't know for sure.

Q. Also, one other thing. I believe you have never read the Warren Commission Report

A. I never said that, I may have said I didn't read it all, but I have read portions of it.

Q. But what I am getting to is that you said in the press that you always believed in the Warren Report, that it was right - is that correct? Did you make that statement?

A. That I always believed in the Warren Report? No, I wouldn't say that, no. Because I had never read it - until after I got involved here.

Q. In other words, you did not ... I was wondering because you and I talked about the Warren Report and did a lot of work on the experts and photography report and both agreed that the thing was wrong in certain aspects. I think also you told the

Jury here at lunch one day - drawing diagrams

A. I confined most of my remarks to this area, that's why.

FOREMAN:

Q. Contrary to what you told us, you did comment about some areas of the Warren Report.

MR. BURNES:

Q. Didn't you say on television that you believed the Warren Report was correct?

A. Basically. I think I did, yes.

Q. Wouldn't that be consistent with the statement that appeared in the newspaper?

A. But I never said it to the paper.

Q. You never said it to the news media?

A. I don't recall saying it to the newspaper - because I saw this a while back - and when I saw it I remarked to who I was with - I don't

Q. It was yesterday's morning paper, that carried it.

A. Well, maybe

Q. Bill, have you talked to Irvin Dymond?

A. Yes, I called him a couple of days ago.

Q. Did you talk to him about the case?

A. About this case?

Q. Yes.

A. No.

Q. Why did you call him?

A. Just to say hello to him.

MR. OSER:

Q. Bill, your statement on television last night that the Warren Report is correct - I know you made the statement - but do you feel it is correct?

A. I feel that it is basically correct. There are some things that I don't understand and that I disagree with, the 399 bullet, I don't swallow that, I told you I never could swallow that.

Q. I know you told me a lot of things that you and I agreed on and our agreement was that certain parts were wrong. That's why I was wondering

A. I am talking about the treatment of people in New Orleans and I don't like to get that version into Dallas. I have my misgivings perhaps about Dallas, but basically I think the Warren Report is right.

Q. Didn't you state on television last night

A. Are we going to continue? Because if we are I am going to have to eat - I have to have something.

Q. Didn't you say last night on television that you believed in the single bullet theory?

A. Y No, I did not.

Q. You didn't state that you believed in the single bullet theory?

A. No, I did not state that I believed in the single bullet theory.

Q. Did you state that you believed in the 3 bullet theory?

A. I did not state that I believed in the 3 bullet theory. I don't remember going into it at all - I don't remember. If I did it would be on tape and you could see it, and you can hear it.

Q. Bill, let me ask you

A. Everybody is saying just let me ask you one more - I am not faking it now, I am telling you now honestly as I can - I want to tell you what I have to say and if you all think I am ridiculous then by God you can drum me right out of here and strip the buttons off, like I should be if you don't believe me.

Q. No, we just want to know - are you prepared to give information of any evidence of wrongdoing on the staff of Mr. Garrison? At this time? Now,

A. In other words, this is the only thing you are interested in - it isn't time to give you the story, you want me to give what you all want.

Q. No, we want you to substantiate these allegations of wrong-

doings and illegal acts.

MR. OSER:

Maybe Mr. LaBiche can ask the questions of what the Jury wants? Today?

A. What does the Jury want?

JUROR:

Q. With reference to Clay Bertrand today when you found out what other people found out ,

A. You talking about Davis?

Q. Yes. Prior to this time when you were with the NBC people and specifically Walter Sheridan, and keeping in mind that NBC stated prior to today that it knew who Clay Bertrand was, did Walter Sheridan at any time tell you who they thought Clay Bertrand was?

A. No sir. He said he knew him, or knew who he was, but did not tell me.

Q. He did not tell you?

A. No sir.

Q. Have you ever discussed anything with Sheridan about our case?

A. I have talked to him in this respect. I would listen to him - I mean like on a professional basis - he was telling me what he was doing because I sort of knew what he was doing, and nothing very specific.

Q. You have never given him any information that was privy to the people in the office?

A. No, I don't remember doing that, Jim.

MR. ALCOCK:

Well, I have other questions, but I don't think Bill is prepared to answer them.

FOREMAN:

I am saying, Bill, I will talk with you maybe tomorrow and let you know if we want to hear you again. OK?

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that the preceding transcript is a true and correct copy of the testimony given, under oath, in the preceding matter, before the Orleans Parish Grand Jury, on the 28th day of June, 1967, and reduced to typewriting by me.

Maureen B. Thiel

